

created a year ago on September 11th, the evidence supporting the connection between 9/11 and Iraq is at best tenuous. So what is the urgency to authorize force right before the election?

Another problem with the broad authority granted in the resolution is that this issue appears to be personal for the President. He admitted as much when he described Saddam Hussein as "the man who tried to kill my Dad." The United States should not go to war to settle a personal vendetta.

In addition to these problems, granting the authority in the resolution is premature because many questions are unanswered. For example, if the President uses the authority granted in this resolution and attacks Iraq, what plans have been made for the governance of Iraq after we win the war.

And what chance is there that a regime change will create any better situation than we have now. We cannot forget that the United States was involved in the regime change in Cuba in which Batista was kicked out and we ended up with Castro. So why isn't it likely that Iraq will select someone who hates us even more than Saddam Hussein.

And other questions need to be addressed, such as, to the extent that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, is it a good idea to invade Iraq and put our troops right in harm's way. "And what will the war cost and how will we pay for it? There is no question that we are willing to pay whatever it costs to be successful in the war, but we can't ignore the questions of "how long" and "how much money." Eighteen months ago, we had the largest budget surplus in American history. Today, even without the costs of a war, we are approaching the largest deficit in American history, with huge deficits projected for the next 10 years. The direct costs of the war have been estimated at \$100 billion; the indirect costs, such as higher oil costs, have not even been estimated. And so, what will we be giving up in terms of being able to fund education and health care and other needs here in the United States? Or is the plan to raise taxes? Or is the plan to just run up more deficits?

What will be the domino effect? If we attack Iraq, Iraq will attack Israel, Israel will attack back, and then everyone in the Middle East will choose sides. How will that make us better off than we are now, especially in our fight against terrorism?

And in the end, what will we have won? In making progress against terrorism, we have to recognize that hate is as much of an enemy as complex weapons. The weapons used to cause mass destruction on 9/11 were boxcutters. Firearms and explosives are easily available in the United States and can be used against buildings or modes of transportation. If the result of the war is that others hate us worse than they do now, then we have to understand that suicide bombings in the United States may increase.

Moreover, that hatred may increase because others will resent that we have chosen to apply rules to others that we are unwilling to have applied to us. We would certainly not tolerate another country applying "regime change" to the United States. And we would never approve of preemptive strikes when there is no imminent threat as an acceptable international policy. Recently, the Administration threatened Iraqi military personnel with

trials as war criminals; but the U.S. policy is not to subject our personnel to the jurisdiction of international criminal tribunals. The CIA has now reported that the chance that Iraq will use chemical or biological weapons has actually increased since all of the talk about war began.

Mr. Speaker, all of these problems persist and questions remain unanswered, and they lead to the same basic uncertainty—what is the plan, both before and after the war, and what are the consequences. Some have argued that a vote against the Resolution is a vote to do nothing. That is not true. We should act, but based on the information we have now, I believe the wisest course is to proceed with the strategy proposed by Secretary of State Powell—U.N. weapons inspections in Iraq enforced with multilateral military power. That strategy has the support of the international community; it is most likely to actually disarm Iraq; it does not require a massive, unilateral invasion force; and it reduces the risk of provoking widespread armed conflict in the Middle East and terrorism in the United States.

I therefore urge my fellow members to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, at its heart this debate tonight is not about Saddam Hussein. That debate is finished. We know that he is a tyrant and a thug. The debate tonight is about what our vision of America in this new age of new threats should be, and the one thing we should all agree on is America is the greatest Nation on Earth because it has always hued to certain principles. It has always matched the might of its Armed Forces with the force of its principles. It has never resorted through trial and tumult and storm to shortcuts even in times of difficulty.

And there are three principles that we should think about tonight: number one, it is an American principle that we engage the international community in a system of mutual security and international law; number two, it is an American principle that countries do not engage in first strikes absent international accord or truly imminent threat; number three, it is an American principle that the United States Congress is the group that makes the declaration of war. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this resolution violates every single one of those basic tenets of American democracy.

They have put some legislative lipstick on it. They put some nice fuzzy language around it. But ultimately it violates this rule: no Congress should give any President a blank check to start a unilateral, ill-timed war, to let him start a war for any reason at any time with or without any allies. And in doing so, these principles are violated.

Let me address the first one, the basic principle that America stands for

international cooperation, and this has been a bipartisan principle for decades in this country. Republican and Democratic Presidents alike have worked with the international community to develop international law, international support systems; and we have led the Nation in doing so.

□ 0020

We have led the Nation, because a world where countries can strike one another without international support, without a true imminent threat, is a law of the jungle. This Nation, even in today's threat, should lead the world forward to international law, rather than backward to the law of the jungle.

This concept is more important after September 11 than less, and it is more important because of what the generals have told us, General Hoar, General Zinni, General Clark. We need to heed their advice, because what they have told us is simple and alarming.

They have told us that if we engage in a unilateral attack in the Middle East, it has the capacity of supercharging Osama bin Laden's recruitment efforts. There is no victory in the destruction of one tyrant while breeding 10,000 terrorists. It is true that a unilateral attack that inflames the Middle East has the capacity of reducing our security rather than increasing it. This violates an American principle.

Second, we have a principle of honoring our troops. We do not owe Saddam Hussein any more time. We do not owe Saddam Hussein anything. But we owe the soldiers and sailors and our sons and our daughters who we would send into the streets of Baghdad the ultimate effort to go the last mile to see if we can resolve the disarmament, and the total disarmament of weapons of mass destruction, before war. We owe our soldiers and sailors to make war the last option, not the first step.

I got a letter from a mother from Wenatchee, Washington, this week making one plea to me that when I took this vote, to say that she understood her son could be involved in a sacrifice at the cause of liberty, but not until every option is exhausted, and every option has not been exhausted. That is why we should pass the separate resolution, which will call for the President to go to the United Nations, get a tough, certain, guaranteed disarmament effort, and get this job done.

Third, we are a people who keep our eye on the ball. We have a principle in this Nation of not becoming distracted, and we do not know why we should take our eye off the ball, off the threat of al Qaeda, which 1 month ago was listed as a high threat of repeated terrorist attacks in this Nation, and go put our precious resources in dealing with what the CIA yesterday said was a low threat of terrorist activities. It does not make sense to the American people to do that.

So for those purposes and those principles, international cooperation, honoring our troops, and keeping our eye